

Purpose of the List

The charter of the REGIONAL_FREQ mailing list is to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas about the relationship of amateur digital interests to the Single Point of Contact concept approved by the amateur coordination community at a meeting called by the ARRL in St Louis on October 7, 1995.

We hope REGIONAL_FREQ will help to develop consensus within the amateur digital community so that we may be effective in our involvement with the process of creating and implementing an SPOC organization.

Mechanics of the List

TAPR is committed to the success of the various SIG lists. All lists have tremendous potential, but TAPR does not want that potential to be lost.

The criteria for appropriate publication are simple: messages should 1) advance the discussion at hand, 2) not perpetuate one of our many Holy Wars (i.e., my OS is bigger than your OS, or "your protocol stinks because"), and 3) avoid personal attacks (FLAMES).

In addition, we wish to re-post traffic generated here on the PBBS network. Therefore, refrain from using profanity, and do not use the forum to promote commercial activity. Please stay focused on the issues which relate to the purpose of the forum charter.

If individuals abuse these standards over time, they will be removed from the list. If such abuse is frequent, the mail list can become moderated at the discretion of the list chairperson.

Our hope is that list members will bear in mind the goals of the list when posting messages, and that very few messages will be considered outside of these standards. If you feel that you must FLAME someone, do it via personal mail or use one of the many other places available to vent spleen. The forums are setup for positive, productive, cooperative discussions.

REGIONAL_FREQ Archive

Past messages from the REGIONAL_FREQ are availble in the TAPR.ORG archives. Send mail to 'listserv@tapr.org' with the following in the message body:

index tapr/regional_freq

Meetings

Qualified participants in REGIONAL_FREQ should make an effort to attend any future meeting(s) called by the ARRL to define or implement the SPOC concept. Qualification includes officer status in a digital organization, recognized digital coordinator, etc. Those who do attend such meetings should caucus among themselves to assure unified, effective representation of the amateur digital community.

A Final Word

Thanks for being involved in REGIONAL_FREQ! The variety of ideas resulting from electronic discussion can assure that we recognize opportunities available to the digital community during the formation of SPOC. Your input is appreciated!

73,

Dan Puckett K5FXB
List Chairperson

My primary email address (at work) is danp@comp.uark.edu, or via packet at K5FXB@KA5BML.#NWAR.AR.USA.NOAM. My home phone number is (501) 443-4021 (before 9:30PM Central, please).

Tucson Amateur Packet Radio
8987-309 E Tanque Verde Rd #337 * Tucson, Az * 85749-9399 * 817-383-0000

To unsubscribe from this mailing list send a message to `listserv@tapr.org` with the following line in the body of the message:

signoff regional_freq

From danp@comp.uark.edu Mon Oct 16 11:48:30 1995
Received: from comp.uark.edu (comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id LAA12207 for <REGIONAL_FREQ@tapr.org>; Mon, 16 Oct 1995 11:48:20 -0500
Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id LAA17879; Mon, 16 Oct 1995 11:48:17 -0500
Date: Mon, 16 Oct 1995 11:48:16 -0500 (CDT)
From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>
To: REGIONAL_FREQ@tapr.org
Subject: Query..
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951016114339.6991G-100000@comp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

A question has been posed about the name of the list. It is still early enough in the life of the list to change the name, if important. Your input on this issue and anything else in my initial statement about the list is welcome.

-DanP

From danp@comp.uark.edu Tue Oct 17 10:53:06 1995
Received: from comp.uark.edu (comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id KAA18685 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 10:53:02 -0500
Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id KAA16979; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 10:52:56 -0500
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 1995 10:52:54 -0500 (CDT)

From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>
To: regional_freq@tapr.org
Subject: Slow Start?
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951016114339.6991G-100000@comp>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951017090810.6991P-100000@comp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Well... it has been a slow first 24 hours on the REGIONAL_FREQ listserv!
Allow me to comment on my interpretation of the sense of "regional" in the
name of the list:

It would seem to me that we represent "regional" packet organizations.

I don't see this effort as an attempt to create an SPOC representing
digital interests before the SPOC being defined by the voice repeater
coordination community and the ARRL (SPOC x 2 or Son of SPOC?). There
really is no national charter for our collective deliberations.

I do see this as an opportunity for regional digital organizations to
identify issues and work toward consensus - and thus to speak with the
same voice when the time comes for input into the nuts and bolts details
of SPOC with the FCC.

Does anyone else care to comment on this or make other statements about
the purpose of the listserver?

...anbody out there?

-DanP

From danp@comp.uark.edu Tue Oct 17 13:16:24 1995
Received: from comp.uark.edu (comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by sys1.tapr.org
(8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id NAA22141; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 13:15:50 -0500
Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id NAA05575; Tue,
17 Oct 1995 13:15:34 -0500
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 1995 13:15:33 -0500 (CDT)
From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>
To: info@code.org, ted@rmed.com, ddailey@adsnet.com, adrs@iea.com,
ki3v@connectus.com, dinod@deltanet.com, jra1054@tntech.edu,
neda@teledm.com, n7ipb@wetnet.wa.com, kb5mu@amsat.org, kb7uv@panix.com,
wo5h@tapr.org
cc: regional_freq@tapr.org
Subject: Regional Packet Freq List
In-Reply-To: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951016105422.6991D-100000@comp>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951017105326.6991R-100000@comp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

The ARRL recently sponsored a meeting of amateur radio frequency
coordinators in St. Charles MO. The purpose of the meeting was to
consider the formation of an organization that would serve as a single
point of contact between regional coordinators and the FCC. The majority
of coordinators present at the meeting voted to do just that! A committee

was chosen to draft a document that would define the new SPOC organization.

Digital interests were fairly well represented at the meeting and the chair promised that input from the digital community would be included in future proceedings related to the SPOC effort.

The digital representatives present at the meeting thought it a good idea to create a listserver to promote discussion of the issues of SPOC as they relate to packet radio. TAPR offered to provide the listserver and it has been activated. The list is open, but wholesale publicity is discouraged. This invitation to join the list is extended to you and your organization as a result of your entry in TAPR's list of regional packet organizations.

The following is from the welcome file for the new subscribers to the list. Perhaps it will give you a better idea of the purpose and scope of this effort. Please join us on REGIONAL_FREQ@TAPR.ORG!

-DanP

```
>
> Welcome to the TAPR Regional Digital Frequency Mailing List!
>
>
> REGIONAL_FREQ is an electronic discussion about:
> -----
>
> 1. Regional (and possibly national) digital bandplanning.
>
> 2. The relationship of digital organizations with established amateur
> frequency coordination organizations (MACC, SERA, T-MARC, etc).
>
> 3. Proper characterization of "coordination" as it applies to amateur
> digital networks.
>
> 4. The role of TAPR and regional digital groups in the formation of a
> proposed organization that will serve as a Single Point of Contact
> for the FCC, regarding amateur frequency coordination issues.
>
> 5. Other topics as deemed relevant to the discussion at hand.
>
> Purpose of the List
> -----
> The charter of the REGIONAL_FREQ mailing list is to provide a forum for
> the exchange of ideas about the relationship of amateur digital interests
> to the Single Point of Contact concept approved by the amateur coordination
> community at a meeting called by the ARRL in St Louis on October 7, 1995.
>
> We hope REGIONAL_FREQ will help to develop consensus within the amateur
> digital community so that we may be effective in our involvement with
> the process of creating and implementing an SPOC organization.
>
> To Subscribe to the List
> -----
> Send e-mail to 'listserv@tapr.org' with the following in the body of the
```

```

> message:
>
>subscribe regional_freq FirstName LastName Callsign
>
>(substitute your own FirstName, LastName and Callsign)
>
>
> REGIONAL_FREQ Archive
> -----
> Past messages from REGIONAL_FREQ are availble in the TAPR.ORG archives.
> Send mail to 'listserv@tapr.org' with the following in the message body:
>
> index tapr/regional_freq
>
> A Final Word
> -----
> Thanks for being involved in REGIONAL_FREQ! The variety of ideas resulting
> from electronic discussion can assure that we recognize opportunities
> available to the digital community during the formation of SPOC. Your input
> is appreciated!
>
> 73,
>
> Dan Puckett K5FXB
> List Chairperson
>
> -----
> Tucson Amateur Packet Radio
> 8987-309 E Tanque Verde Rd #337 * Tucson, Az * 85749-9399 * 817-383-0000
> *****

```

```

From gjones@tenet.edu Tue Oct 17 13:21:18 1995
Received: from Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu [198.213.2.9])
by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id NAA22502 for
<regional_freq@tapr.org>; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 13:21:10 -0500
Received: (from gjones@localhost) by Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id
NAA32101 for regional_freq@tapr.org; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 13:21:07 -0500
From: Greg Jones <gjones@tenet.edu>
Message-Id: <199510171821.NAA32101@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu>
Subject: Re: 440 APRS monitoring links (fwd)
To: regional_freq@tapr.org (Dan Puckett)
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 1995 13:21:07 -0500 (CDT)
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL23]
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 2675

```

This is something that this group might be interested in looking at ?
The APRS operators are trying to work out a national freq in order to
provide APRS operations anywhere you go and thus track amateur dogs in this.

The problem is easy -- no one can agree. This is a good example why people
point at digital operations as being a problem -- because someone will
eventually come up in their weak signal area or where ever.

[illegible]

From gjones@tenet.edu Tue Oct 17 13:25:24 1995
Received: from Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu [198.213.2.9])
by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id NAA22561 for
<regional_freq@tapr.org>; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 13:25:20 -0500
Received: (from gjones@localhost) by Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id
NAA16608 for regional_freq@tapr.org; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 13:25:18 -0500
From: Greg Jones <gjones@tenet.edu>
Message-Id: <199510171825.NAA16608@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu>
Subject: Re: 440 APRS monitoring links (fwd)
To: regional_freq@tapr.org (Dan Puckett)
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 1995 13:25:17 -0500 (CDT)
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL23]
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 2645

Here is maybe a better message on the subject ?

Cheers - Greg

According to Bob Hartman:
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 1995 13:03:56 -0500
From: n8mwz@alpha.wcoil.com (Bob Hartman)
To: aprssig@tapr.org
Subject: [APRSSIG:3892] Re: 440 APRS monitoring links

Recently, Bob Wilkins said:

>Please Please work with your local repeater coordinating committee. The
>frequency 445.925 is not a packet frequency except in a small town in
>Maryland! There are many voice repeaters here in California using this
>frequency. Other areas of the country have used this frequency to link
>additional voting receivers to their two meter systems. Please do not
>start a war with the established users.
>
>Part 97 is specific when it comes to who solves the problem when an
>uncoordinated use interferes with a coordinated use. Unlike the two meter
>band the 420 - 450 band has sub-bands for auxiliary as well as repeater
>use. Two meter packet is uncoordinated, except by local band plan. Part 97
>requires coordination in the auxiliary and repeater sub-bands. 445.925 is
>in the repeater and auxiliary sub-band and should be coordinated by a
>local coordinator. 145.79 is not in a repeater or auxiliary sub-band so
>the use is mandated by local band plans. No one has exclusive use.

>There are many folks out here that would like all mentions of their uhf
>repeater frequency removed from the APRS help files.
>
>IF YOU THINK YOU NEED A NATION-WIDE frequency why not write to the major
>coordinating bodies before setting your standards. The ARRL is seriously
>taking up this issue, and is now working with the local coordinators to
>strengthen the local band planning process. Now is the time to get involved.

Bob Hartman replies:

It is not my intention to advocate using any kind of a 440 link where it would create a problem to other hams. I totally agree that if your area has some sort of coordination for these frequencies, that you should only use any kind of a link on any frequency without their coordination. My suggestion of using some frequency in the 440 band was only because of the number of hams that already have dual band radios that would benefit. If it were just for me, personally, I could use 2.4 gigs and have plenty of room.

```
////////////////////////////////////
//// Bob Hartman, N8MWZ           Grid Square EN70           ////
//// Lima, Ohio                   40 45N, 084 06W           ////
//// <n8mwz@amsat.org>             Member ARRL, AMSAT, &      ////
//// VHF, UHF, OSCAR 13 {soon}    TAWG #0H89               ////
////////////////////////////////////
```

From ki3v@connectus.com Tue Oct 17 16:55:40 1995
Received: from africa.connectus.com (africa.connectus.com [199.245.160.100]) by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id QAA29185; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 16:54:21 -0500
From: ki3v@connectus.com
Received: from rnodx.connectus.com (rnodx.org [199.245.161.2]) by africa.connectus.com (8.6.10/8.6.9) with SMTP id OAA08528; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 14:23:35 -0700
X-Mailer: SuperTCP for Windows Version 4.00 R2 (Mailer Version 1.02)
Message-ID: <30835D92-00000001@rnodx.connectus.com>
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 1995 02:38:53 cdt
Subject: Re: Regional Packet Freq List
To: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>, info@code.org, ted@rmed.com, ddaley@adsnet.com, adrs@iea.com, dinod@deltanet.com, jra1054@tntech.edu, neda@teledm.com, n7ipb@wetnet.wa.com, kb5mu@amsat.org, kb7uv@panix.com, wo5h@tapr.org
Cc: regional_freq@tapr.org
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: Multipart/Mixed; Boundary="PGBRBDNLZPPFWKR-30835D93"

--PGBRBDNLZPPFWKR-30835D93
Content-Type: Text/Plain; Charset=US-ASCII

Great!! Glad to see a list on What other areas are doing for Packet Coordinations. At first here in Nevada we ran into a road block with a few sysops. After getting support from the majority of the Packet sysops here in Northern Nevada and Southern Nevada we have put together a Coordination Group under the ARRL recognized CARCON Repeater Group here. Our organization is called the Nevada Packet Coordinators Committee (NPCC). For those interested I can send you a copy of our second Quarterly Newsletter...Called "The Rag". Just forward me your address and I'll throw you on the mailing list.

I have attached a Word 6.0 copy of our current bandplan. Those

[illegible]

////////////////////////////////////
MQAAADIAAAAzAAAAANAAADUAAAA2AAAAANwAAADgAAAA5AAAAOgAAADsAAAD+////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////8BAP7/
AwoAAP////8ACQIAAAAAAMAAAAAABGHAAAAE1pY3Jvc29mdCBXb3JkIDYuMCEBb2N1bWVu
dAAKAAAAATVNXb3JkRG9jABAAAAABXb3JkLkRvY3VtZW50LjYA9DmycQAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAANDP
EeChsRrhAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAANDPEeChsRrhAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAD4AAwD+/wkABgAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAQAAAAEAAAAAAAAABAAAAIAAAABAAAA/v///wAAAAAAAAA////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////
////////////////////////////////////+8yQAAEMoAAP////9nAAYAAAAAAH8BAAD////////////////////////////////////
SMoAAP////////////////////////////////awAGAAAAAAD/AQAA////////////////////////////////9jJAAD////////////////////////////////SMoAAGgABgAAAAANAMAAP//
//9IygAA////////////////////////////////TJAABqAAYAAAAAPIBAAD////////////////////////////////2MkAACzKAAD////////////////////////////////AgCkBLQAAAACAHAI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Ag
ICAgNDQ2LjA5NSAgOTYwMCBjYXVvKSAgICAgIDQ0Ni4wNTAgIDk2MDAgYmF1ZA0gICAg
ICA0NDYwMDc1ICBMb2NhbcBSRU5PL0NBUI1NPTiAN5NjAwIHVzZXIgaW5wdXQgdG8gVEFCQlMg
LyBEWCBDTFVTVEVSVIC8gS0VZQk9BUKQgCQ0gICAgICAgMzkgTWh6ICAoVG8gYmUgRGV0ZXJt
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AAAAAwAA
AA
AA
AAAD////////
//8AA
AA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAP////////////////wAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAP7/AAADXwAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAEAAADghZ/y+U9oEKuR
CAA±J7PZMAAAANACAAA0AAAAABwAAAjgAAAAACAAA3AAAAAQAAAAgAQAAACAAAAEQBAAMAAAA
aAEAAAsAAACMAQAADQAAALABAAAPAAAA1AEABAAAAAD4AQAAACgAAABwCAAAASAAAAQAIAAA4A
AABkAgAACQAAAIgCAAAATAAA±AIAAP//////////////////////////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//////////////////////////
//////////////////////////
//////////////////////////
//////////////////////////
//////////////////////////
//////////////////////////cpWUAM8AJBAAAAAB1AAAAAAAAAAAAAAwAAeAsAAFAZAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAeAgAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABQAAKAB
AAAAFAAAoAEAAKAVAAAAAAABUAAAAAACgFQAAAAAAAKAVAAAAAAABUAAABQAAADaFQAA
AAAAANoVAAAAAA2hUAAAAAADaFQAAAAAAANoVAAAAAA2hUAAAOAAADkFQAAAFgAAANoV
AAAAAAAhgAAEYAAAD6FQAAAAAAAPoVAAAAAAAHUAAAAAAD6FQAAAAAAAPoVAAAAAA
+hUAAAAAAD6FQAAAAAAAPoVAAAAAAAHBYAAIAAACGFgAAAAAAIYWAAAAAAAhYAB4A
AAACKFgAA1AAAAHgXAADUAAATBgAAB4AAACwGAAAVAAAAAQZAABMAAAAhgAAAAAAAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAABUAAAAAAD6FQAAAAAAABBgAHAAEAawD6FQAAAAAAAPoVAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAPoVAAAAAAAHUAAAAAABqGAAAAAAAPoVAAAAAAABUAAAA
AACgFQAAAAAAAPoVAAAAAAAPoVAAAAAAAPoVAAAAAAAHUAAAAAAD6FQAA
AAAAAPoVAAAAAAAHUAAAAAACgFQAAAAAAAPoVAAAAAAABUAAAAAAD6FQAAAAAAIQW
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAALQVAAA0AAAAwhUABgAAACgFQAAAAAAAKAVAAAAAA
oBUAAAAAACgFQAAAAAAAPoVAAAAAAAHBYAAAAAD6FQAAigAAAPoVAAAAAA
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAABOZXZhZGEgUGFja2V0IENvb3JkaW5hdG9ycyBD
b21taXR0ZWUNIk5Qq0MiDU5vcnRoZXJuIE5ldmFkYSBQYWNrZXQgQmFuZHBsYW4NKEFkb3B0

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

--PGBRBDNLZPPFWKR-30835D93--

```
At 11:03 AM 10/17/95 -0500, you wrote:
>Well... it has been a slow first 24 hours on the REGIONAL_FREQ listserv!
>Allow me to comment on my interpretation of the sense of "regional" in the
>name of the list:
>
>It would seem to me that we represent "regional" packet organizations.
>
```

Hello All.

I agree that we represent "regional" or state organizations in our digital efforts, but perhaps more than any other "coordination" group, we need some NATIONAL guidelines. I would think the name of this server should possibly reflect two things (if possible). 1. The DIGITAL aspects (regional_freq doesn't make it for me). 2. The fact that this is intended to provide a forum for nationwide discussion toward solving a future issue - national coordination of packet/digital use.

>I don't see this effort as an attempt to create an SPOC representing
>digital interests before the SPOC being defined by the voice repeater
>coordination community and the ARRL (SPOC x 2 or Son of SPOC?). There
>really is no national charter for our collective deliberations.
>

I agree - if the SPOC comes to pass, and IF they also include the recognition of digital as a real mode requiring coordination, we should use that SPOC. If they fail in these two attempts, then we should look at organizing our own system to achieve these goals.

73, Karl
Internet: medcalf@atabank.com
Packet: WK5M @ WK5M.#NEKS.KS.USA.NOAM

***** The views and opinions expressed here are mine and do not *****
***** necessarily reflect those of my employer! *****

From medcalf@atabank.com Tue Oct 17 19:01:12 1995
Received: from exodus.atabank.com (exodus.atabank.com [198.3.149.253]) by
sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id TAA00113 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>;
Tue, 17 Oct 1995 19:01:06 -0500
Received: from law3-ts2.atabank.net by exodus.atabank.com (8.6.5/950818.08ccg)
id TAA21140; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 19:01:03 -0500
Message-Id: <199510180001.TAA21140@exodus.atabank.com >
X-Sender: medcalf@atabank.com
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Wed, 18 Oct 1995 00:00:53 +0000
To: regional_freq@tapr.org
From: "Karl Medcalf (WK5M)" <medcalf@atabank.com>
Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:7] Re: Regional Packet Freq List

At 04:58 PM 10/17/95 -0500, you wrote:

>Great!! Glad to see a list on What other areas are doing for Packet
>Coordinations. At first here in Nevada we ran into a road block with
>a few sysops. After getting support from the majority of the Packet
>sysops here in Northern Nevada and Souther Nevada we have put together
>a Coordination Group under the ARRL recognized CARCON Repeater Group
>here. Our organization is called the Nevada Packet Coordinators
>Committee (NPCC). for those interested I can send you a copy of our
>second Quarterly Newsletter...Called "The Rag". Just forward me your

>address and Ill throw you on the mailing list.
>

Hello Rich.

Thanks for sending your bandplan around. This also shows the need for our digital listserv system that's being implemented. Here in Kansas, we are NOT permitted the use of frequencies between 440.00 and 444.00 for ANY purpose other than the "coordinated" ATV that exists. Obviously this eliminates our possible implementation of at least a part of your bandplan, and likewise you could not implement the same plan we have.

I think these are the kind of topics we should discuss here, and provide a unified request/input to the coordinators at the state and regional level expressing our concerns.

Without their "blessing" on frequencies, we are stuck with taking whatever we can get, which is often different from state to state.

BTW - we don't all have Word (fortunately I have WordView) so I'd suggest that all such posts and attachments be saved in ASCII format.

73, Karl
Internet: medcalf@atabank.com
Packet: WK5M @ WK5M.#NEKS.KS.USA.NOAM

***** The views and opinions expressed here are mine and do not *****
***** necessarily reflect those of my employer! *****

From gjones@tenet.edu Tue Oct 17 21:29:08 1995
Received: from beall.tenet.edu (Nadine-Ruth-Beall.tenet.edu [198.213.2.11]) by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id VAA04447 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 21:29:00 -0500
Received: (from gjones@localhost) by beall.tenet.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id VAA22944 for regional_freq@tapr.org; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 21:28:54 -0500
From: Greg Jones <gjones@tenet.edu>
Message-Id: <199510180228.VAA22944@beall.tenet.edu>
Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:9] Re: Regional Packet Freq List
To: regional_freq@tapr.org
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 1995 21:28:53 -0500 (CDT)
In-Reply-To: <199510180001.TAA21140@exodus.databank.com > from "Karl Medcalf" at Oct 17, 95 07:02:11 pm
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL23]
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 2118

Hi everyone -- I will be setting up an FTP area on the TAPR.ORG server this week -- so we can drop these documents off in a central place to be stored. Will let you know when it is ready.

Cheers - Greg

According to Karl Medcalf:

>
> At 04:58 PM 10/17/95 -0500, you wrote:
> >Great!! Glad to see a list on What other areas are doing for Packet
> >Coordinations. At first here in Nevada we ran into a road block with
> >a few sysops. After getting support from the majority of the Packet
> >sysops here in Northern Nevada and Southern Nevada we have put together
> >a Coordination Group under the ARRL recognized CARCON Repeater Group
> >here. Our organization is called the Nevada Packet Coordinators
> >Committee (NPCC). for those interested I can send you a copy of our
> >second Quarterly Newsletter...Called "The Rag". Just forward me your
> >address and I'll throw you on the mailing list.
> >
>
> Hello Rich.
>
> Thanks for sending your bandplan around. This also shows the need for our
> digital listserv system that's being implemented. Here in Kansas, we are NOT
> permitted the use of frequencies between 440.00 and 444.00 for ANY purpose
> other than the "coordinated" ATV that exists. Obviously this eliminates our
> possible implementation of at least a part of your bandplan, and likewise
> you could not implement the same plan we have.
>
> I think these are the kind of topics we should discuss here, and provide a
> unified request/input to the coordinators at the state and regional level
> expressing our concerns.
>
> Without their "blessing" on frequencies, we are stuck with taking whatever
> we can get, which is often different from state to state.
>
> BTW - we don't all have Word (fortunately I have WordView) so I'd suggest
> that all such posts and attachments be saved in ASCII format.
>
>
> 73, Karl Internet: medcalf@atabank.com
> Packet: WK5M @ WK5M.#NEKS.KS.USA.NOAM
>
> ***** The views and opinions expressed here are mine and do not *****
> ***** necessarily reflect those of my employer! *****
>
>
>

From gjones@tenet.edu Tue Oct 17 22:43:43 1995
Received: from Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu [198.213.2.9])
by sys1.tapir.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id WAA06622; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 22:43:22
-0500
Received: (from gjones@localhost) by Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id
WAA21428; Tue, 17 Oct 1995 22:43:20 -0500
From: Greg Jones <gjones@tenet.edu>
Message-Id: <199510180343.WAA21428@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu>
Subject: NEWSLINE RADIO - CBBS EDITION #948 - POSTED 10/13/95
To: regional_freq@tapir.org (Dan Puckett), tapir-board@tapir.org (TAPR Board),
tprs-board@tapir.org (TPRS Board)
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 1995 22:43:19 -0500 (CDT)

X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL23]
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 11050

+++++

NEWSLINE RADIO - CBBS EDITION #948 - POSTED 10/13/95

Check with your local amateur radio club to see if NEWSLINE can be heard weekly on the air in your area.

Articles may be reproduced if printed in their entirety and credit is given to AMATEUR RADIO NEWSLINE as being the source.

The following is a QST

Repeater coordinators meet in St. Louis and change the very basis of repeater coordination. Also more on the aftermath of Hurricane Opel and another Big MACC attack. These stories and more on Newsline report number 948 for release on Friday, October 13, 1995 coming your way right now!

REPEATER COORDINATORS MEET

The nations repeater frequency coordinators have met with the ARRL and the FCC in St. Charles, Missouri. It was a politically charged meeting that has changed the face of VHF operation forever. This is because there is now a tentative agreement by which the American Radio Relay League has tentatively agreed, subject to board approval, to represent the nations coordinators to the FCC. This, in exchange for the commission recognizing the work of the coordinators and possibly making their decisions binding on the ham radio community.

The meeting was held at the Best Western Noah's Ark motor hotel not far from the St. Louis Airport. About fifty of the nations sixty five recognized repeater coordinators were present. Also in the room were representatives of packet radio, amateur television and other modes that use the VHF and UHF spectrum, but from the outset it was made clear that this meeting was to discuss the problems of FM voice repeater coordination only. Even though he was there unofficially, the tone of the meeting was set by the keynote speaker Ralph Haller, N4RH, Deputy Chief of the FCC's Wireless Telecommunications Bureau:

"I'm particularly delighted that all of you have taken time from your schedules to be here and you have shown so much interest in this matter, that you would come to St. Louis on a Saturday.

I would like to ask that we try to stay focused. In talking to you, I know a number of you in this room have lots of other concerns. Enforcement, changes in the volunteer examine program, but that is not what today's meeting is about. Today's meeting is to talk about frequency coordination. An opportunity to get to really get to know each other. And it's an opportunity to bring frequency coordination to yet a higher plateau. So during the day let's stay focused on the real issue of why we

are here. Let's not get side tracked on other issues that can easily take up the day. Let's stay focused on frequency coordination. This is a truly historic day in the history of Amateur Radio." Haller, N4HY

Historic yes, but not without its problems. For a while, the entire proceeding seemed to be slipping away as the political differences between various coordinators and between some coordinators and the ARRL took center stage. As a result, much of the early discussion derailed into matters of finite detail rather than the general picture that Haller had requested. So, not unlike other legislative bodies in a state of conflict, the group recessed. It was when the meeting reconvened that headway began. Owen Wormser, K6LEW, the president of the Mid Atlantic Repeater Council was the person who brought it back on track:

"For the sake of a beginning can we agree that those that are listed in the current ARRL Repeater Directory as coordinators for their specific areas etc. are in fact the baseline from which we can begin. Perhaps, but not the final solution, perhaps not the end of it, but can we agree that that is at least the beginning. Because where the next point goes is, if that is agreed then we have something else to say. And that is that in the longer term our objective is to produce the white paper which will be delivered by a committee from this organization. Not an ad hoc committee. This is our organization. So our committee will deliver to Mr. Haller the white paper. That white paper out of our consensus down stairs will address the specificity of a single point of contact, an organization, not a single individual paralleling very closely the commercial representation to the FCC in the form of a single point of contact. And that in order to get some recognized coordinators to single point of contact, there is a lot of specificity that must be put into this white paper." Wormser, K6LEW

Owen Wormser set the stage for the group to arrive at a consensus, but it would be many more hours before this would happen. A turning point came with the comments of Jim Fortney, K6IYK, who chairs Southern California's 220 MHz Spectrum Management Association. If Owen Wormser gave the assemblage its direction, it was Jim Fortney that added purpose:

"It has become very clear to me and I hope it would be clear to the majority of the rest of you, that the environment that the FCC finds itself in no longer allows us to use the methods and techniques that we have used in the past to deal with them. And that in fact that we better look at some new approaches. And one of those approaches that is being used elsewhere and has been suggested from a variety of directions that would be advantageous to us is if we, and I am talking about amateur radio, not repeater coordination necessarily, but amateur radio in total, we amateur radio had someone who represented us to the FCC." Fortney

Discussions and debates lasted another four hours. In the end it was decided to name the American Radio Relay League as the single point of contact, or spoc, between the nations frequency coordinators and the FCC. A committee chaired by Owen Wormser, K6LEW was empowered to draft a white paper setting forth the goals of the spoc. This paper will be circulated to all the nations recognized frequency coordinators listed in the ARRL repeater directory for comment before a final version is submitted. All

of this seemed to please the FCC's Haller:

"Clearly this afternoon, I think tremendous progress has been made. And I look forward to continuing to work with this group and your representatives who will ultimately be working with us directly in Washington. I think this is a giant move forward for Amateur Radio and I think it says a lot that all of you come here with such diverse views and in the course of a few short hours reach this kind of consensus." Haller

There is still a lot to be done before recognition of the work of coordinators becomes reality. Two of the biggest hurdles are drafting a white paper acceptable to most coordinators and for the ARRL's Board of Directors to vote on whether or not it really wants the spoc job. The latter will happen in mid January.

But assuming both of these tasks are accomplished, it may eventually mean that the average ham, people like you and me who simply operate FM with a mobile rig or an HT can be assured that the day of the so-called pirate repeater will come to an end. That our ability to communicate through our favorite repeater with a minimum of interference from another uncoordinated and unwanted repeater on the same channel pair, will be assured. And from a users point of view, what more can an FM enthusiast want.

NEW MACC MEMBERS

Also making news in St. Charles is an announcement by the giant Mid America Coordination Council. The big MACC, as it has become known, has swallowed up two more regions. Not surprising was the decision by Eastern Washington state and the Idaho Panhandle to fall under the MACC umbrella. What caught everyone by surprise was an announcement by California's Northern Amateur Relay Council that it too was joining MACC. Don Smith, W6NKF, the President of NARC says its time that hams in California drop their isolationist policies:

"The way that coordination and everything else is going to go. If we have a united front, we have a better of than if we are a bunch of splinters. And I think we need, in this point in time, a united front." Smith

Does this mean that Southern California is next? Probably not. This is because frequency coordination in Southern California is by several different organizations acting as caretakers for various repeater subbands. Also, there is the turmoil on two meters as to who really is the frequency coordinator with nine groups challenging the long term coordinator for that position. Southern California will have to solve a lot of regional problems before any umbrella group will bother to give it an ear.

Meantime, the Mid America Coordination Council is now a consortium of 22 amateur radio frequency coordination entities serving 18 states and portions of 3 others. Each entity is autonomous within the MACC organization with all MACC frequency coordination policies and guidelines being advisory only. In addition to providing mutual recognition of

frequency coordinators, MACC provides in house technical assistance and dispute mediation to those regions and entities requesting such services.

* * * Newsline is copyright 1995 All rights are reserved * * *

+++++

Hams may be used to grabbing two meter simplex channels, as the coordinators could not coordinate exclusive use except by mode as described in a local band plan.

The auxiliary and repeater sub-bands have always been coordinated to a amateur trustee for a specific use, location, erp power and area of coverage.

Coordination is far different than band planning as it gives specific rights to those who are coordinated as found in Part 97 of the rules.

I could not find any coordinated packet stations on 445.925 in the ARRL repeater directory. I found ten states with coordinated voice repeaters and found most of the north east coordinators had coordinated the frequency as an fm voice simplex frequency. This makes sense as there are few simplex voice frequencies in the 440 repeater sub-band

Looking closely in the directory you will see many coordinated packet activities across the nation in the auxiliary band near 439 MHz. This is the area of the band we should be looking for APRS backbone frequencies as we grow the network.

Most packet stations would rather be slightly removed from the 440 repeater band so their receiver is not desensed by the local 440 repeater. In the major metropolitan areas of the country packet and voice must share the same hilltop for good coverage.

It is to our collective advantage to have our activities coordinated, then next years grabbers will not be inclined to grab our frequencies.

Bob n6fri

Bob Wilkins	work	bwilkins@cave.org
Berkeley, California	home	rwilkins@ccnet.com
94712-2354	play	n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

From danp@comp.uark.edu Wed Oct 18 14:42:59 1995

Received: from comp.uark.edu (comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by sys1.tapir.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id OAA31643 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>; Wed, 18 Oct 1995 14:42:54 -0500

Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id OAA14841; Wed, 18 Oct 1995 14:42:46 -0500

Date: Wed, 18 Oct 1995 14:42:45 -0500 (CDT)

From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>

>Can we let the fact that the list is hosted by TAPR imply this aspect?
>

I'm not sure being hosted by TAPR implies digital as much as PACKET. I think in the big picture (to avoid a massive blow-up 10 years from now) we should look toward including ALL digital modes (even if that means digital VOICE).

>> doesn't make it for me). 2. The fact that this is intended to provide a
>> forum for nationwide discussion toward solving a future issue - national
>> coordination of packet/digital use.
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^
>How about REGIONAL_COORD for the new name?
>

What distinguishes regional VOICE coordinators from regional digital? Why must we remain regional? True that we represent regional areas, but we have nationwide (and even international) goals that may not be shared by other modes.

(BTW - just thought I'd kick this idea out for comments, but as you noted, looks kinda slow on this remailer so far.)

73, Karl
Internet: medcalf@atabank.com
Packet: WK5M @ WK5M.#NEKS.KS.USA.NOAM

***** The views and opinions expressed here are mine and do not *****
***** necessarily reflect those of my employer! *****

From kn4aq.gary@mms.raleigh.nc.us Thu Oct 19 06:49:43 1995
Received: from redstone.interpath.net (redstone.interpath.net [199.72.1.7]) by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id GAA22792 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Thu, 19 Oct 1995 06:49:39 -0500
From: kn4aq.gary@mms.raleigh.nc.us
Received: from mms.raleigh.nc.us (uucp@localhost) by redstone.interpath.net (8.6.12/8.6.14) with UUCP id HAA17121 for regional_freq@tapr.org; Thu, 19 Oct 1995 07:48:28 -0400
Received: by mms.raleigh.nc.us
id 0A09U001 Thu, 19 Oct 95 07:35:53
Message-ID: <9510190735.0A09U00@mms.raleigh.nc.us>
Organization: MMS Information Systems - (919)779-6674, TELNET BBS.MMS.NET
X-Mailer: TBBS/TIGER v1.0
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 95 07:35:53
Subject: List Name
To: regional_freq@tapr.org

. . . Quoting a message from Regional_freq@tapr.org:

>From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>
>To: regional_freq@tapr.org
>Subject: [REGIONAL_FREQ:2] Query..
>

>A question has been posed about the name of the list. It is still early
>enough in the life of the list to change the name, if important. Your

>input on this issue and anything else in my initial statement about the
>list is welcome.
>
>-DanP

Hi, Dan and All...

It might be a good idea to keep the list name a little obscure, since we're not encouraging wholesale subscription -- let's see if it becomes hard to let the intended audience know it exists.

73,

Gary Pearce KN4AQ
VP/FC Packet>East of NC
kn4aq.gary@mms.net
KN4AQ @ N1GMV.#RTP.NC.US.NOAM

Gary Pearce
KN4AQ
Raleigh, NC
From danp@comp.uark.edu Thu Oct 19 16:06:20 1995
Received: from comp.uark.edu (comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by sys1.tapir.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id QAA07243 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>; Thu, 19 Oct 1995 16:06:15 -0500
Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id QAA07827; Thu, 19 Oct 1995 16:06:13 -0500
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 1995 16:06:12 -0500 (CDT)
From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>
To: regional_freq@tapir.org
Subject: Add to Mailing List (fwd)
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951019160310.7873V-100000@comp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

Gary, I have forwarded the info file to Chris.
Thanks for the referral!

-DanP
----- Forwarded message -----
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 95 07:35:54
From: kn4aq.gary@mms.raleigh.nc.us
To: danp@comp.uark.edu
Subject: Add to Mailing List

Hi, Dan...

Could you add Chris to the mailing list for Regional-Freq? He responded to my post on FidoNet.

Here's his info. Thanks & 73, Gary KN4AQ

+++++

. . . Quoting a message from Chris Boone:

>Count me in.....as RF tech Director of TCAPS (TEXAS Coastal Amateur Pack
>based in Houston, we are the local Digital packet coordinators....

>

>and feel that some form of packet coordination needs to be addressed but
>the point where nodes, etc can be run off the channel (as almost happene
>neighboring state because one person wanted to be ALL....the PBBS, gatew
>and when the msgs he didnt like got zapped at his station, someone else
>a new node on the same channelllllno problem BUT if his idea of packet
>coordination had been around, the new node wouldve been forced off the a
>NOONE would have benefitted except his ego....)

>

>I think as packet and other digital modes go, we need to manage our spec
>differently from analog voice systems (FM, ACSSB, etc)....

>I think that primarily, packet coordinators should make recommendations
>where major nodes should go and if someone else crops up there and inten
>jamming occurs, then the packet coordinating body steps in...(there was
>jamming by the second group in the above scenario...though it is alleged
>primary party did cause some jamming of the newer second node because th
>on "his" channel..)

>

>Hope to hear from you and others...my E mail address is currently thru
>Compuserve....

>72732.2610@compuserve.com....

>

>I hope to have an address thru my company's Internet tie shortly..

>(cboone@entergy.com)

>

>73

>Chris

>WB5ITT

>Former board member TX VHF FM Society

>RF TEch director TCAPS

Gary Pearce

KN4AQ

Raleigh, NC

kn4aq.gary@mms.raleigh.nc.us

From danp@comp.uark.edu Thu Oct 19 17:01:39 1995

Received: from comp.uark.edu (comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by sys1.tapir.org
(8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id RAA08758 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>; Thu, 19 Oct
1995 17:01:35 -0500

Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id RAA05937; Thu,
19 Oct 1995 17:01:32 -0500

Date: Thu, 19 Oct 1995 17:01:32 -0500 (CDT)

From gjones@tenet.edu Fri Oct 20 02:53:06 1995
Received: from Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu [198.213.2.9])
by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id CAA29810 for
<regional_freq@tapr.org>; Fri, 20 Oct 1995 02:53:03 -0500
Received: (from gjones@localhost) by Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id
CAA10179 for regional_freq@tapr.org; Fri, 20 Oct 1995 02:53:01 -0500
From: Greg Jones <gjones@tenet.edu>
Message-Id: <199510200753.CAA10179@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu>
Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:17] Re: List Name
To: regional_freq@tapr.org
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 1995 02:53:01 -0500 (CDT)
In-Reply-To: <199510200721.BAA10904@chunks.gag.com> from "Bdale Garbee" at Oct 20,
95 02:38:25 am
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL23]
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 1238

I read a very interesting dissertation paper the other day concerning the
analysis of discourse on various listservs. One of the areas that the
researcher noted of interest was the amount of time people spent talking
about new list names -- and the researcher felt that lots of time was wasted
on the importance of the name over the discourse.

So I agree with Bdale 100%

Anyway -- does it matter what the name of the list is ? If the name keeps
people from joining -- yeah better change it.

Getting back to the list topic at hand ---

Has a second meeting been set yet ?

Does anyone know the schedule of getting the SPOC written ?

I think we should try to get Jim Fortney on the list, since he is a digital
person and is on the committee writing the SPOC. He could give us updates.

Cheers - Greg

According to Bdale Garbee:

>
> In article <Pine.SOL.3.91.951019162717.7873Z-100000@comp> you wrote:
> : There have been some preparations toward a change to REGIONAL_COORD. So,
> : those of you who can't live with that, PLEASE SPEAK UP... If we are to
> : change it, let's get it done soon!
>
> I don't see the point. REGIONAL_COORD doesn't make any more sense than
> REGIONAL_FREQ. Leave it alone.
>
> Bdale, N3EUA
>

From medcalf@atabank.com Fri Oct 20 06:55:42 1995
Received: from exodus.atabank.com (atabank.com [198.3.149.253]) by
sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id GAA02111 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>;
Fri, 20 Oct 1995 06:55:37 -0500
Received: from law3-ts6.atabank.net by exodus.atabank.com (8.6.5/950818.08ccg)
id GAA02365; Fri, 20 Oct 1995 06:55:33 -0500
Message-Id: <199510201155.GAA02365@exodus.atabank.com >
X-Sender: medcalf@atabank.com
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 1995 11:55:26 +0000
To: regional_freq@tapr.org
From: "Karl Medcalf (WK5M)" <medcalf@atabank.com>
Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:18] Re: List Name

>Getting back to the list topic at hand ---

>

>Has a second meeting been set yet ?

>

Hello all.

>From the info I have, the next meeting would be in the Feb, Mar, Apr time
frame, location not yet decided, but probably mid-west somewhere. Cities
mentioned were St. Louis, Kansas City, Chicago, Dallas, Denver.

>Does anyone know the schedule of getting the SPOC written ?

>

I think the first draft of the MOU is due on November 7, and will be posted
in the remailer (supposedly).

>I think we should try to get Jim Fortney on the list, since he is a digital
>person and is on the committee writing the SPOC. He could give us updates.

>

I agree. I have fears in the back of my head that say the MOU will not touch
digital coordination at all.

73, Karl

Internet: medcalf@atabank.com

Packet: WK5M @ WK5M.#NEKS.KS.USA.NOAM

***** The views and opinions expressed here are mine and do not *****
***** necessarily reflect those of my employer! *****

From rishmael@halnet.com Fri Oct 20 09:10:04 1995
Received: from interlock.halnet.com (interlock.halnet.com [34.0.92.2]) by
sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with SMTP id JAA06468 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>;
Fri, 20 Oct 1995 09:08:50 -0500
Received: by interlock.halnet.com id AA45629
(InterLock SMTP Gateway 3.0 for regional_freq@tapr.org);

Fri, 20 Oct 1995 09:06:15 -0500
Message-Id: <199510201406.AA45629@interlock.halnet.com>
Received: by interlock.halnet.com (Protected-side Proxy Mail Agent-1);
Fri, 20 Oct 1995 09:06:15 -0500
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 1995 09:02:43 -0500
X-Sender: rexi@pigeon
X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"
To: regional_freq@tapr.org
From: "Rex H. Ishmael" <rishmael@halnet.com>
Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:17] Re: List Name

At 02:38 AM 10/20/95 -0500, you wrote:

>In article <Pine.SOL.3.91.951019162717.7873Z-100000@comp> you wrote:
>: There have been some preparations toward a change to REGIONAL_COORD. So,
>: those of you who can't live with that, PLEASE SPEAK UP... If we are to
>: change it, let's get it done soon!
>
>I don't see the point. REGIONAL_COORD doesn't make any more sense than
>REGIONAL_FREQ. Leave it alone.
>
>Bdale, N3EUA
>

Agreed, I checked in to find out/input into any plans for coordinating
digital frequencies, not worry about a name for the group.
No matter what the SIG is called it needs to move on to the issues.

Of importance to me, is where are these established regional coordination
groups? The last information I had about the Okla. Repeater coordinator is
he retired, and no one has stepped up to assume that "non-gratis" job. He may
have been working with a regional group, but I am in the dark about all of
this. A little published information in generally wide spread amateur
documents would be helpful (ie; QST and TAPR quarterly). Maybe the group here
need not be overly advertised until we have something worthwhile to present,
but the general population needs some awareness level raising too.

=====
Rex Ishmael, Environmental Engineer, Halliburton Energy Services
E-Mail: rishmael@halnet.com
Amateur Mail: WD0AJG@WD0AJG.#SCOK.OK.USA.NOAM
=====

From: gjones@tenet.edu Fri Oct 20 11:39:12 1995
Received: from Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu [198.213.2.9])
by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id LAA11210 for
<regional_freq@tapr.org>; Fri, 20 Oct 1995 11:38:23 -0500
Received: (from gjones@localhost) by Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id
LAA11151 for regional_freq@tapr.org; Fri, 20 Oct 1995 11:37:54 -0500
From: Greg Jones <gjones@tenet.edu>
Message-Id: <199510201637.LAA11151@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu>
Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:19] Re: List Name
To: regional_freq@tapr.org
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 1995 11:37:53 -0500 (CDT)

In-Reply-To: <199510201155.GAA02365@exodus.databank.com > from "Karl Medcalf" at
Oct 20, 95 07:12:00 am
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL23]
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 981

According to Karl Medcalf:

> >

>

> I agree. I have fears in the back of my head that say the MOU will not touch
> digital coordination at all.

>

It wouldn't surprise me at all - because the purpose of the meeting was to
handle the VHF/UHF... repeater coordination issues in regards to interface to
the FCC - correct ?

This then only has to do with coordination of repeater systems. Repeater
are easy to point to and are defined very well.

I know in Texas we only coordinate digital systems that use repeater
offsets. Bandplanning is the method used for all other digital areas.

The question that is going to concern the digital area will be where the
line is drawn between bandplanning and freq coordinations.

Coming to terms with how people view this in various regional areas is the key.

Greg

P.S. To throw a little wrench into the engine -- what happens when we start
to implement SS systems that require no coordination because they don't
interfer ?

From danp@comp.uark.edu Fri Oct 20 14:40:01 1995
Received: from comp.uark.edu (comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by sys1.tapir.org
(8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id OAA18032 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>; Fri, 20 Oct
1995 14:39:57 -0500
Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.7.1/8.7.1) id OAA05840; Fri,
20 Oct 1995 14:39:53 -0500 (CDT)
Date: Fri, 20 Oct 1995 14:39:52 -0500 (CDT)
From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>
To: regional_freq@tapir.org
Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:17] Re: List Name
In-Reply-To: <199510200721.BAA10904@chunks.gag.com>
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951020143700.12245D-100000@comp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

On Fri, 20 Oct 1995, Bdale Garbee wrote:

>
> I don't see the point. REGIONAL_COORD doesn't make any more sense than
> REGIONAL_FREQ. Leave it alone.
^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

Thank you, Bdale!! and so it shall be!

-DanP K5FXB

From jayt@comtch.iaa.com Fri Oct 20 15:46:12 1995

Received: from comtch.iaa.com (comtch.iaa.com [198.17.249.2]) by sys1.tapir.org
(8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id PAA20971 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>; Fri, 20 Oct
1995 15:46:05 -0500

Received: by comtch.iaa.com (8.6.10/SMI-4.1)

id UAA05471; Fri, 20 Oct 1995 20:45:56 GMT

Message-Id: <199510202045.UAA05471@comtch.iaa.com>

Subject: Re: Discussion

To: regional_freq@tapir.org

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 1995 13:45:56 -0700 (PDT)

From: "Jay Townsend" <jayt@comtch.iaa.com>

In-Reply-To: <199510201637.LAA11151@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu> from "Greg Jones" at
Oct 20, 95 11:56:40 am

X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL24]

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Content-Length: 2162

Greg Jones wrote:

>
> According to Karl Medcalf:
> > >
> >
> > I agree. I have fears in the back of my head that say the MOU will not touch
> > digital coordination at all.
> >
>
> It wouldn't surprise me at all - because the purpose of the meeting was to
> handle the VHF/UHF... repeater coordination issues in regards to interface to
> the FCC - correct ?
>
> This then only has to do with coordination of repeater systems. Repeaters
> are easy to point to and are defined very well.

And are well defined in the rules and regulations. But I think that its
important to add digital if at all possible.

> I know in Texas we only coordinate digital systems that use repeater
> offsets. Bandplanning is the method used for all other digital areas.

Here in Eastern Washington/Idaho Panhandle we co-ordinate all systems
including packet and even some weird simplex freq's.

> The question that is going to concern the digital area will be where the
> line is drawn between bandplanning and freq coordinations.

Its fairly clear to me looking at band planning that this has never been a particularly well thought out process. An easy example is the extra area at the bottom of 2 meters reserved for something for so long that will never (IHMO). The "spare" satellite band.

> Coming to terms with how people view this in various regional areas is the
> key.

Agreed. Because of hilltops in this part of the country that have extreme range capabilities we tend to co-ordinate everything possible and have had good luck with our local co-ordinator. Are problems have been when putting up long range links into adjacent states. Some will co-ordinate and some don't believe digital worthy or worth the effort.

Co-ordination also really helps in dealing with the repeater folks which often if not always share these high mountain tops. If everyone knows what is going where and on what frequency a lot of problems can be avoided and this includes control and links. (Which usually are also co-ordinated around here, tho they seem to be much like digital in that its more of a gentlemen's thing).

--

Jay Townsend, WS7I < jayt@iea.com >

From medcalf@atabank.com Fri Oct 20 19:55:21 1995

Received: from exodus.atabank.com (atabank.com [198.3.149.253]) by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id TAA29152 for <regional_freq@tapr.org>; Fri, 20 Oct 1995 19:55:15 -0500

Received: from law3-ts4.atabank.net by exodus.atabank.com (8.6.5/950818.08ccg) id TAA17703; Fri, 20 Oct 1995 19:55:11 -0500

Message-Id: <199510210055.TAA17703@exodus.atabank.com >

X-Sender: medcalf@atabank.com

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Sat, 21 Oct 1995 00:55:04 +0000

To: regional_freq@tapr.org

From: "Karl Medcalf (WK5M)" <medcalf@atabank.com>

Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:21] Re: List Name

At 11:56 AM 10/20/95 -0500, you wrote:

>According to Karl Medcalf:

>> >

>>

>> I agree. I have fears in the back of my head that say the MOU will not touch
>> digital coordination at all.

>>

>

>It wouldn't surprise me at all - becuae the purpose of the meeting was to
>handle the VHF/UHF... repeater coordination issues in regards to interface to
>the FCC - correct ?

It's been a little hard to follow the APRS 440 thread, as it's been mixed in with an awful lot of other mail -- I think I'll need to get a few extra internet addresses to keep all the mailing list stuff straight.

A nationwide channel would be great for APRS... but several other uses may claim the same advantage, and accomodating them all (or even just APRS) might be difficult.

The various regional band plans might not overlap enough, and even if they do, existing use may not permit one channel to be chosen nationwide without dislocating current users.

But if it can be done... let's do it.

We now have the opportunity to pool our resources so we can look nationwide and see what's available. Below I've included the digital portion of the SERA band plan, adopted last year. Some of the channels are already in use here in North Carolina.

73,
Gary Pearce KN4AQ
VP/FC Packet>East of NC
kn4aq.gary@mms.net

SERA UHF BAND PLAN:

This is the digital portion of the 440 MHz band plan that SERA announced last year.

Channel Center	Note
430.050	100 kHz Wideband Simplex
430.150	100 kHz Wideband Simplex
430.250	100 kHz Wideband Simplex
430.350	100 kHz Wideband Simplex
430.450	100 kHz Wideband Simplex
430.550	100 kHz Wideband Simplex
430.650	100 kHz Wideband Simplex
430.750	100 kHz Wideband Simplex
430.850	100 kHz Wideband Simplex
430.950	100 kHz Wideband Simplex

440.025/445.025	50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlaid on 100 kHz pair)
440.050/445.050	100 kHz Wideband Pair
440.075/445.075	50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlaid on 100 kHz pair)
440.125/445.125	50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlaid on 100 kHz pair)
440.150/445.150	100 kHz Wideband Pair
440.175/445.175	50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlaid on 100 kHz pair)
440.225/445.225	50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlaid on 100 kHz pair)
440.250/445.250	100 kHz Wideband Pair
440.275/445.275	50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlaid on 100 kHz pair)

440.325/445.325 50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlaid on 100 kHz pair)
440.350/445.350 100 kHz Wideband Pair
440.375/445.375 50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlaid on 100 kHz pair)
440.425/445.425 50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlaid on 100 kHz pair)
440.450/445.450 100 kHz Wideband Pair
440.475/445.475 50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlaid on 100 kHz pair)

440.525/445.525 Narrowband Pairs (note: bandplan actually calls
440.550/445.550 for 12.5 kHz split channels -- only the 25 kHz
440.575/445.575 channels are listed here, both to save space,
440.600/445.600 and because I don't think they're usable - KN4AQ)
440.625/445.625
440.650/445.650
440.675/445.675
440.700/445.700
440.725/445.725

440.925 Narrowband simplex (note: bandplan also calls for
440.950 12.5 kHz split channels here, also)
440.975
441.000 ----- SERA "National Packet Simplex Channel" (used as
441.025 network backbone in NC)
441.075
441.100
441.125
441.150
441.175

Gary Pearce

kn4aq.gary@mms.raleigh.nc.us

KN4AQ

Raleigh, NC

From medcalf@atabank.com Sun Oct 22 16:51:15 1995

Received: from exodus.databank.com (exodus.databank.com [198.3.149.253]) by
sys1.tapir.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id QAA07777 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>;
Sun, 22 Oct 1995 16:51:09 -0500

Received: from law3-ts13.databank.net by exodus.databank.com (8.6.5/950818.08ccg)
id QAA12057; Sun, 22 Oct 1995 16:51:04 -0500

Message-Id: <199510222151.QAA12057@exodus.databank.com >

X-Sender: medcalf@atabank.com

X-Mailer: Windows Eudora Light Version 1.5.2

Mime-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii"

Date: Sun, 22 Oct 1995 21:50:57 +0000

To: regional_freq@tapir.org

From: "Karl Medcalf (WK5M)" <medcalf@atabank.com>

Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:25] APRS, SERA, 440 plan

At 04:16 PM 10/22/95 -0500, you wrote:

>

>

>

>

APRS and the SERA 440 Band Plan

>

>>This is something that this group might be interested in looking at ?

>>The APRS operators are trying to work out a national freq in order to

>>provide APRS operations anywhere you go and thus track.....

>>

>>Cheers - Greg

>

>

>It's been a little hard to follow the APRS 440 thread, as it's been mixed
>in with an awful lot of other mail -- I think I'll need to get a few extra
>internet addresses to keep all the mailing list stuff straight.

>

>A nationwide channel would be great for APRS... but several other uses may
>claim the same advantage, and accomodating them all (or even just APRS)
>might be difficult.

>

>The various regional band plans might not overlap enough, and even if they
>do, existing use may not permit one channel to be chosen nationwide without
>dislocating current users.

>

>But if it can be done... let's do it.

>

>We now have the opportunity to pool our resources so we can look nationwide
>and see what's available. Below I've included the digital portion of the
>SERA band plan, adopted last year. Some of the channels are already in use
>here in North Carolina.

>

>73,

>Gary Pearce KN4AQ

>VP/FC Packet>East of NC

>kn4aq.gary@mms.net

>

>

>

SERA UHF BAND PLAN:

>

>This is the digital portion of the 440 MHz band plan that SERA announced
>last year.

>

>Channel Center Note

>

>430.050 100 kHz Wideband Simplex

>430.150 100 kHz Wideband Simplex

>430.250 100 kHz Wideband Simplex

>430.350 100 kHz Wideband Simplex

>430.450 100 kHz Wideband Simplex

>430.550 100 kHz Wideband Simplex

>430.650 100 kHz Wideband Simplex


```

>430.750          100 kHz Wideband Simplex
>430.850          100 kHz Wideband Simplex
>430.950          100 kHz Wideband Simplex
>
>
> *****
>
> 440.025/445.025    50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlayed on 100 kHz pair)
>440.050/445.050    100 kHz Wideband Pair
> 440.075/445.075    50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlayed on 100 kHz pair)
> 440.125/445.125    50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlayed on 100 kHz pair)
>440.150/445.150    100 kHz Wideband Pair
> 440.175/445.175    50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlayed on 100 kHz pair)
> 440.225/445.225    50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlayed on 100 kHz pair)
>440.250/445.250    100 kHz Wideband Pair
> 440.275/445.275    50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlayed on 100 kHz pair)
> 440.325/445.325    50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlayed on 100 kHz pair)
>440.350/445.350    100 kHz Wideband Pair
> 440.375/445.375    50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlayed on 100 kHz pair)
> 440.425/445.425    50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlayed on 100 kHz pair)
>440.450/445.450    100 kHz Wideband Pair
> 440.475/445.475    50 kHz Wideband Pair (overlayed on 100 kHz pair)
>
>
> *****
>
> >440.525/445.525    Narrowband Pairs (note: bandplan actually calls
>440.550/445.550    for 12.5 kHz split channels -- only the 25 kHz
>440.575/445.575    channels are listed here, both to save space,
>440.600/445.600    and because I don't think they're usable - KN4AQ)
>440.625/445.625
>440.650/445.650
>440.675/445.675
>440.700/445.700
>440.725/445.725
>
>
> *****
>
> >440.925            Narrowband simplex (note: bandplan also calls for
>440.950            12.5 kHz split channels here, also)
>440.975
>441.000 ----- SERA "National Packet Simplex Channel" (used as
>441.025            network backbone in NC)
>441.075
>441.100
>441.125
>441.150
>441.175
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Gary Pearce          kn4aq.gary@mms.raleigh.nc.us
>KN4AQ

```

>Raleigh, NC
>
>

Hello gang.

Well, as I mentioned before, I would whole-heartedly support a national bandplan for packet. The SERA bandplan looks reasonable, except in this area (MACC) we are not permitted the use of any frequencies from 440 to 444 for packet or even for voice repeaters due to ATV being installed in the area.

This is part of what we need to work on to provide a workable backbone, and I'm sure it will take a lot of time and inter-regional discussions to resolve. Let me know what I can do from this end to help.

73, Karl
Internet: medcalf@atabank.com
Packet: WK5M @ WK5M.#NEKS.KS.USA.NOAM

***** The views and opinions expressed here are mine and do not *****
***** necessarily reflect those of my employer! *****

From danp@comp.uark.edu Tue Oct 24 11:12:16 1995
Received: from comp.uark.edu (comp.uark.edu [130.184.253.197]) by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id LAA23102 for <REGIONAL_FREQ@tapr.org>; Tue, 24 Oct 1995 11:12:13 -0500
Received: (from danp@localhost) by comp.uark.edu (8.7.1/8.7.1) id LAA18610; Tue, 24 Oct 1995 11:12:10 -0500 (CDT)
Date: Tue, 24 Oct 1995 11:12:08 -0500 (CDT)
From: Dan Puckett <danp@comp.uark.edu>
To: REGIONAL_FREQ@tapr.org
Subject: FTP Area for REGIONAL_FREQ
Message-ID: <Pine.SOL.3.91.951024101927.25285D-1000000@comp>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: TEXT/PLAIN; charset=US-ASCII

There is now an area on the TAPR server for files contributed by regional_freq subscribers. I have placed ASCII versions of the two state bandplans (KS and NV), that have been posted to the list, in that area. You may retrieve those files via anonymous ftp to tapr.org - the upload directory is: /tapr/SIG/regional_freq/upload. The two bandplan files are: ks.plan.txt and nv.plan.txt. You may also upload files into that area that you think might be of interest to the group. A brief note to the group, explaining the files that you upload, might be in order.

Due to a hard disk crash, any mail addressed to me between 2 a.m. and 11:15 a.m. (CDT) yesterday (10/23) could be lost. If I fail to respond to something, please try again :-)

-DanP

From gjones@tenet.edu Sun Oct 29 00:17:26 1995

Received: from Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu [198.213.2.9])
by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id AAA12245 for
<regional_freq@tapr.org>; Sun, 29 Oct 1995 00:17:22 -0500
Received: (from gjones@localhost) by Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id
AAA19112 for regional_freq@tapr.org; Sun, 29 Oct 1995 00:17:21 -0500
From: Greg Jones <gjones@tenet.edu>
Message-Id: <199510290517.AAA19112@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu>
Subject: St Louis Meeting Tape
To: regional_freq@tapr.org (Dan Puckett)
Date: Sun, 29 Oct 1995 00:17:20 -0500 (CDT)
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL23]
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 219

Bill Pasternack sent me the tapes from the meeting. Very interesting
hearing what Rod Stafford and Ralph had to say.

With a few hours of work on my end -- they will be available via the TAPR
web page.

Cheers - Greg

From gjones@tenet.edu Tue Oct 31 00:27:57 1995
Received: from Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu [198.213.2.9])
by sys1.tapr.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id AAA22980; Tue, 31 Oct 1995 00:27:54
-0600
Received: (from gjones@localhost) by Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id
AAA31075; Tue, 31 Oct 1995 00:27:47 -0600
From: Greg Jones <gjones@tenet.edu>
Message-Id: <199510310627.AAA31075@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu>
Subject: St Louis Meeting Audio
To: regional_freq@tapr.org (Dan Puckett), tapr-board@tapr.org (TAPR Board),
tapr-sys@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu,
dewayne@warpspeed.com (Dewayne Hendricks)
Date: Tue, 31 Oct 1995 00:27:47 -0600 (CST)
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL23]
Content-Type: text
Content-Length: 852

Hi folks -- I need some feedback on the following page:

<http://www.tapr.org/tapr/html/arrrlstlouis.html>

before making it available to everyone.

After spending about 30 hours, I took the tapes that Bill Pasternak, WA6ITF,
sent me on the meeting, endocded them in AIF format, encoded them again in
realaudio and generated a web page with necessary text. Lots of fun :-)

Anyway -- the result is that the entire meeting is now available via the
internet.

There are a few holes to be filled - so if you have a callsign or I got a name
wrong, let me know.

The audio turned out really well - except for folks that didn't use the mics in the back (then you can;t hear them).

Let me know what you think.

I still need to record the welcome message -- so that will result in an error.

If everything looks okay -- we can make annouce it.

Cheers - Greg

From chilton@emc.com Tue Oct 31 11:25:02 1995
Received: from emc.com (ns0.emc.com [168.159.3.1]) by sys1.tapir.org (8.6.12/8.6.9) with ESMTP id LAA10982 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>; Tue, 31 Oct 1995 11:24:59 -0600
Received: from lss1074.lss.emc.com (lss1074.lss.emc.com [168.159.49.74]) by emc.com (8.6.8.1/8.6.9) with ESMTP id LAA06557 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>; Tue, 31 Oct 1995 11:29:57 -0500
Received: (from chilton@localhost) by lss1074.lss.emc.com (8.6.8.1/8.6.9) id LAA08640 for regional_freq@tapir.org; Tue, 31 Oct 1995 11:29:49 -0500
Date: Tue, 31 Oct 1995 11:29:49 -0500
From: Ken Chilton <chilton@emc.com>
Message-Id: <199510311629.LAA08640@lss1074.lss.emc.com>
To: regional_freq@tapir.org
Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:29] St Louis Meeting Audio

Could you make the AIF files available on ftp?

KC

From gjones@tenet.edu Tue Oct 31 14:23:26 1995
Received: from Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (gjones@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu [198.213.2.9]) by sys1.tapir.org (8.7.1/8.7.1) with SMTP id OAA18749 for <regional_freq@tapir.org>; Tue, 31 Oct 1995 14:23:23 -0600
Received: (from gjones@localhost) by Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu (8.6.12/8.6.12) id OAA31958 for regional_freq@tapir.org; Tue, 31 Oct 1995 14:23:19 -0600
From: Greg Jones <gjones@tenet.edu>
Message-Id: <199510312023.OAA31958@Leslie-Francis.tenet.edu>
Subject: Re: [REGIONAL_FREQ:30] Re: St Louis Meeting Audio
To: regional_freq@tapir.org
Date: Tue, 31 Oct 1995 14:23:19 -0600 (CST)
In-Reply-To: <199510311629.LAA08640@lss1074.lss.emc.com> from "Ken Chilton" at Oct 31, 95 11:29:22 am
X-Mailer: ELM [version 2.4 PL23]
Content-Type: text

Nope. The entire AIF file sizes (for all files) was 400+ Megs. 40 mins of audio was about 60Megs of AIF file. RealAudio makes it 60 Megs to about 1.3Megs.

Lucky I had a 2Gig HD.

Greg

According to Ken Chilton:

>
> Could you make the AIF files available on ftp?
>
> KC
>
>